

REMARKS

Claim 1-25 are pending in the above-referenced patent application. Claims 10-15 were allowed. Claims 2-9, 18, 19 and 21-25 were objected to as being dependent on rejected base claims, but deemed allowable if written in independent form including limitations of base claims and intervening claims. Applicant wishes to thank the Examiner for detailing the allowed and allowable claims.

Claims 1, 16, 17 and 20 were rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by USPN 6,657,322 to Skibinski et al. ("Skibinski"). Claims 1 and 16 have been amended to further clarify the claimed limitations. No new matter has been added.

Rejection of Claims 1, 16, 17 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e)

Rejection of Claims 1, 16, 17 and 20 is respectfully traversed because Skibinski does not disclose all of the claimed limitations.

Regarding Claim 1, Skibinski does not disclose an active filter that can be connected to a power line between a power source and a load, the active filter comprising: a current generator that can be connected to the power line, wherein in response to a control signal the current generator generates a current i_{APF} to compensate for polluting harmonics on the power line; and a controller that generates a control signal that controls the current generator to compensate for

the polluting harmonics on the power line, “**such that the current i_{APF} from the current generator does not exceed a selected threshold value,**” as required by Claim 1 (emphasis added).

Skibinski may mention a current generator connected to a power line which is controlled by a control signal. However, at a minimum, Skibinski does not disclose that a controller controls a current generator to generate a compensation current (i_{APF}) which “does not exceed a selected threshold value,” as required by Claim 1. Unlike Skibinski, according to the claimed invention, the compensation current is limited below a predetermined threshold.

Indeed, Skibinski in Col. 6, lines 7-61 (relied on by the Examiner), discusses general issues related to controlling the harmonic currents on the power lines, but mentions nothing about limiting the APF current. Nowhere in Skibinski is there a teaching or suggestion of limiting the compensation current to a threshold value, as claimed herein. If the Examiner believes otherwise, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner clearly point to such specific disclosure in Skibinski. For at least these reasons, rejection of Claim 1 and all rejected claims dependent therefrom, should be withdrawn.

Claim 16 was rejected for similar reasons as Claim 1, and is therefore allowable for at least the reasons provided above in relation to Claim 1.

As per Claim 17, as discussed Skibinski does not teach or suggest a current threshold value. There is no mention in Skibinski of controlling a current such that it does not exceed a current threshold value. There is no mention of a limiter feature in the controller that limits a compensation current to a threshold value. If the Examiner believes otherwise, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner clearly point to such specific disclosure in Skibinski. For at least these reasons, rejection of Claim 17 should be withdrawn.

With regard to rejected claim 20, the examiner indicates that because the claimed structure is fully met by Skibinski, the recited function will be inherent. This interpretation of Skibinski is respectfully traversed. The claimed limitations are not fully met, as Skibinski makes no indication, or reference to the claimed steps of:

the current i_{APF} is controlled such that:

$$i_{APF} = \begin{cases} i_L - v_s / R_{EM} ; & |i_L - v_s / R_{EM}| < I_{max} \\ I_{max} ; & |i_L - v_s / R_{EM}| \geq I_{max} \end{cases},$$

where R_{EM} represents the equivalent resistance seen by the input voltage source v_s , and I_{max} represents said selected threshold value.

If the Examiner believes otherwise, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner clearly point to such specific disclosure in Skibinski. For at least these reasons, rejection of Claim 20 should be withdrawn.

Conclusion

For the above reasons, and other reasons, it is respectfully submitted that rejection of the claims should be withdrawn. Reexamination, reconsideration and allowance of all claims are respectfully requested.

Please continue to send all communications to the agent of record.

Respectfully submitted,

MYERS DAWES ANDRAS & SHERMAN, LLP




Michael Zarabian, Reg. No. 39,886
Authorized Representative
19900 MacArthur Blvd., 11th Floor
Irvine, CA 92612
(949) 223-9600

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service first class mail in an envelope addressed to:

Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Arlington, VA 22313 on March 31, 2005.

Sarah A. Nielsen
(Name of person mailing paper)



(Signature of person mailing paper)